The first part of the seventh volume of the English translation of the History of the City of Rome in the Middle Ages, by FERDINAND GRE-OOROVIUS (London, George Bell & Son), covers the period from 1421 to 1496. The second part of the same volume comprehends some four hundred pages, and brings us to the death of Pope Alexander VI. It is in this second part that the Italian Renaissance is considered at length. There, also, will be found a survey of the city, according to its regions, about the year 1500. Meanwhile, the three-quarters of a century with which we are immediately conof Nicholas V., Pius II. and Rodrigo Borgia. who, when he assumed the Papal chair, took the name of Alexander VI.

I.

The true Middle Age of the city of Rome may be said to have closed when Pope Martin V. returned from the Council of Constance. Gregorovius might have looked upon his task then ended were it not that the universal character of the Holy City seemed to demand a continuation of her history through the period of transition that followed down to the time when the Roman ecclesiastical ideal of the Middle Ages was shattered by the German Reformation. During the hundred years that intervened was accomplished the great transformation of Europe which is called the Renascence. In the Latin world, this movement looke I like the ran iscence of classic paganism; in the German world, it proved to be the revival of evangelical Christlantty. To the combine i working of these two divisions of the European intellect, modern civilization owes its rise. There is no doubt that, in the first half of the fifteenth century, or, to be more exact, after the Council of Constance, Europe experienced a radical change. It passed from the fantastic world of the Middle Ages to a more or less accurate comprehension of the practical conditions of life. The spell of dogmatic transcendentalism in which the Church had held it captive was gradually dissolved by learning and the discoveries of science. As the fifteent century advanced, great events opened a wider horizon to the men of central and western Europe and procured them an unexpected

Latins and Germans shared in the outcome

of these events. The former revived the gods. the sages and the poets of classical antiquity they illumined with the torch of ancient knowledge the uncritical darkness in which scholastic theology and superstition had borne sway, and embellished life with the beauties of art At the same time, they burst the geographical frontiers of the ancient world. They sailed through the Pillars of Hercules, discovered the passage to the Indies, and, finally a new world. America. As the Germans had formerly acquired the teachings of Christfanity from the Latins, so now they received from them the treasures of ancient culture, which they mastered so quickly and thoroughly as to give assurance of their future power in the domain of learning. They themselves discovered the practical art of printing, which gave wings to thought and endowed it with Immortality. Their philosophical intellect soon reformed two antiquated systems, the Ptolemaic scheme of astronomy and the Gregorian plan of the all-ruling Papacy. Was it merely accident, asks Gregorovius, that the fall of the Eastern Roman Empire took place at this time The terrible power of the Ottoman Turk deended on the City of Constantine as a Mohammedan Cæsarism threatening Europe with Asiatic barbarism and forcing its States to form political alliances and to enter into a more active intercourse. The Popes conceived the idea of a revival of the Crusades, but the medisval idea proved dead; faith in the Church no longer inspired a world which had grown practical and was now stirred only by political motives. The particular political interests of ndent States had usurped the place of the theogratic principle. Nationality or hereditary monarchy now took shape, as in Spain, France, England and Austria. These kingdoms struggled with one another for the hegemony of Europe. Congresses of the secular powers ded to ecclesiastical councils: the atpt to maintain the balance of political power perseded the ecumenical authority of Em-

peror and Pope. profoundly shaken, found itself in a new era, once more seated, it is true, in Rome, but no longer as the universal power that had moved at its will the Western world. If still strong through its administrative network, it was able to effect the restoration of its dogmatic and hierarchic prestige, it had to recognize that its great ideal preponderance had perished. The age of the European renascence saw the Papacy gular power, which, based on the foundations of a petty principality, grew into a considermonarchy. The transformation which was practically in harmony with the spirit of the times, but prejudicial to the Church itself. Gregorovius would explain by the large measere of autonomy which States and peoples had acquired, by the loss of the great spiritual mis-sions of the Middle Ages, by the cessation of the historic struggle with the Imperial Power and lastly by the downfall of civic freedom in Rome. The continued existence of the Capline republic in the Holy City would unpubtedly have obliged the Popes of the fifteenth century to turn their attention mainly to the spiritual sphere. Having become, on the contrary, absolute rulers of Rome, they shandoned their exalted tasks as high priests of Christianity to build up ecclesiastical States secular princes. From thirst for power and the desire of family aggrandizement they threw themselves into the political traffic of the Italian Commonwealths; they were no endowed, however, with sufficient material strength to obtain supremacy over Italy. Owing no less to the nepotism of her Popes an to the despotic ambition of her princes the Italian Peninsula finally became the spoil of foreign conquerors.

ms to the author of this history that the Papacy of the Renascence, which took its rise in the creative impulse of the time, prein the main a terrifying spectacle, and the highest services which some Popes rendered to learning and art do not in the judgment of porovius atone for the loss which the Caththe Church suffered through the demoralize tion of the Papal power, now become unlimited Our author thinks that to conceal the extent ad nature of these evils would be at the presmt day an idle task. Had not the Popes of afteenth century refused the reforms h were desired by the whole of Europe, had they not get the advantage of the Papacy before that of the Church, the great religious don would scarcely have taken place. surope saw herself threatened in the fifteenth with a new Roman absolutism, which was the more intolerable in that it was based so so elevated religious or social ideas. Vulgar temporal instincts of ambition or avarice governed the Papacy at a period of unbounded prelity. The discontented nations enfured the deepest and now scarcely credible cration of Christianity and the continued as of the voracious Curia on their estates and bishoprics, on their consciences and their property, until the beginning of the sixteenth ry, when the measure was full. Germany, which for long centuries had been linked to Rome by the imperial idea, severed herself from Papacy by her national reform, and the rewas the independence of a large part of he German world, and through it the rise of sew culture, the centre whereof was no longer Church. In the deliverance of peoples and States from the guidance of the Holy City ed by the German Reformation, the second period of Rome's worldwide supremacy and he Middle Ages came to an end.

So far as the seventh volume of this history its chief aim the mastery of a finished style. time of the reigns of certain notable Popes, to wit: Nicholas V., Pius II., Paul II. and Alex-France from his invasion of Italy.

1447 under the name of Nicholas V., was the son of a surgeon; he was born on Nov. 15, 1397. Early deprived of his father, he studied in Lucea and Bologna, and subsequently acted as tutor in the families of the Strozzi and Albizzi at Florence; returning to Bologna, he acquired the favor of Nicholas Albergati, then Bishop and afterward Cardinal, whom he served as majordomo for twenty years and accompanied to Florence when the Curia had its seat there. He formed ties of close intimacy with the literary circles of that city, the Macenas of which, at that time, was Cosimo di Medici. Without possessing genius, Parentucelli was distinguished for readiness of intellect, great command of language and a memory so retentive that he knew by heart entire works of poets, scholars and philosophers. Eneas Sylvius Piccolomini, the conspiouous humanist who became Pope Pius II., said of Nicholas V. that "what was unknown to Parentucelli lay putside the sphere of human learning;" there ems to be no doubt that the knowledge of this, the greatest bookman of the age, embraced almost the entire compass of the culture of his time. Supported by Cosimo, for whom he arranged the library in St. Marco, he collected and copied MSS, and books. In 1443, on the death of his patron Albergati, he entered the service of Landriani. This Cardinal also soon died, and Parentucelli now rose in the Church. Pope Eugenius IV. made him successively Vice-Chamberlain, Bishop of Bologna and Cardinal. The extraordinary eloquence which he displayed in the funeral oration delivered by him over Eugenius IV. is said to have cause the Conclave to elect him to the Papacy. If, in earlier times, the Papal elections had

been the outcome of ecclesiastical currents or political influences, it was apparently learning that now gave a Pontiff to the world. In Nicholas V. humanism ascended the Chair of Peter, and contemporaries hailed a new which virtue and wisdom rose to power. The elevation of an unpretending scholar to the Papacy was, undoubtedly, an event. Nicholas himself aid to his friend Vespasiano, the Florentine bookseller: "It will disturb the pride of many that a priest who was only good for ringing sells has been made Pope, and could the Florentines have believed it?" The study of books and documents had made him pale and deliite, but not morose. He was full of Attic wit. His unimposin; figure had nothing of his predecessor's dignity; tortured by gout he was easily irritated, but easily soothed. lie was an enemy to all ceremonial, accessible o every one, incapable of dissimulation. During his reign, which lasted but eight ears, occurred the fall of Constantinople. Had he lived longer, it is possible that a resolute attempt might have been made to recover that city by the Christian powers. When he died in 1455, he could comfort himself with the thought that he had done little evil and much good. The wealth which he had accumulated had neither been devoted to war nor squandered on nephews. As Pope he had led the simple life of a scholar, and was so far removed from princely arrogance that, in place of armorial bearings, he always made use of the Keys of Peter. His ambition was directed to a single object, that of glorifying the Papacy by spiendid monuments, and of exalting its authority in the domain of intellect by making Rome the centre of learning. Thus, in his forecast, the Papacy, while its religious nimbus faded, was to prove itself the intellectual power of the age. Everything undertaken by Nicholas V. was

Chair. In the eyes of the Apostles this aim

would not have been accepted as the Christian ideal, and they would doubtless have explained to the excellent Pope that he confused the affairs of the Roman ecclesiastical State with those of the Christian republic "I have," said Nicholas V., in the speech which he addressed on his dying bed to the Cardinals, "so reformed and strengthened the Holy Roman Church, which I found ruined by wars and oppressed with debts, that her Schism has been brought to an end, and her cities and castles are recovered. I have built magnificent fortresses for her defence, I have adorned her with splendid structures and have liberally endowed her with beautiful works, with pearls and jewof the rarest workmanship, with books and draperies, with gold and silver vessels and with valuable sacred vestments. All these treasures I have collected, not through simony, or in cupidity, but, or the contrary, I have practi ed liberality in every way: in architecture, in the purchase of books, in the transcription of Latin and Greek manuscripts and in paying for the services of learned men." At a later epoch, as, for instance, in the time of Julius II., and Leo X, the supposition that a Pope should have found it necessary to justify his love of splendor would have excited laughter. Nicholas V., however, found it necessary to defend it in the eyes of contemporaries of the reforming Council. His farewell is, consequently, his apology, a vindication of his life against the reproaches of those meh who adhered to an cient beliefs. Surveyed from the highest Christian viewpoint, it shows that the ideals of the Pope were entirely bounded by the a sthetic horizon. Under Nicholas V., the Papaci began to display a splendid ceremonial. If this splendor would have failed to command the approval of St. Jerome or St. Bernard, magnificence in the outer forms of religion seemed needful to the men of this age in order that the mind might be elevated by the contemplation of stateliness and beauty. According to this Pope's ideas the Church had closed her period of struggle and entered on that of her rlumph. Encouraged by the spirit of antiquity, she wrapped herself in a mantle of ceremonial magnificence; sympathy with classic forms developed with increasing strength, and assumed an entirely Pagan coloring. The sumptuous secularization of the Papacy, fact, began under Nicholas V., although this man, essentially noble, was unable to foresee its consequences. It reached its zenith under Leo X. But the Popes of the Mæcenas-like House of Medici, more voluptuous in their feeling for the beautiful, and with a finer sense for intellectural luxury, possessed neither the scholarly enthusiasm nor the grandeur of aims exhibited by Parentucelli, the poor

protégé of Cosimo. Nicholas V. was succeeded by a veteran of 77, Alfonso Borgia, a Valencian, who became Pope under the name of Calixtus III. His short reign of three years was devoid of importance. The Vatican resembled an infirmary where the gouty Pope spent the greater part of his time by candle-light in bed, surrounded by nephews or mendicant monks. He held the splendid tastes of his predecessor in dislike and looked with contempt on the sumptuous buildings lately begun, the foundations of which were already falling to decay. He honored learning only in so far as it had practical applications and censured the extravagance of Nicholas V. who had lavished on MSS, and jewels money that might have been devoted to the war against the Turks. We again encounter a sympathetic figure in the Papal chair when, in 1458, Eneas Sylvius Piccolomini became Pope under the name of Pius II. This remarkable man had been long known to the world; there was not in Europe a single prince or statesman, not a Bishop or a scholar, who was not acquainted with him either personally or by repute. He was a descendant of the Piccolomini of Siena, a family which had once enjoyed celebrity, but had fallen into decay at the end of the fourteenth century. Banished with other nobles from Siena by the popular party, the Piccolemini dweit in poverty at Corsignano, where Eneas was born on Oct. 10, 1405. Against his will he studied law in Siena, and afterward became a pupil of Filelfo and Poggio in Florence. Endowed with conspicuous talents but without ful candidate sent four mules loaded any decided bent, he forsook serious studies to devote himself to poetry. He acquired the humanistic culture of the time, which comprised knowledge of the ancient classics and had for His joyous nature fitted him for a belcaprit: he knew nothing of the goading impulse nder VI., down to the return of Charles VIII. to by which great missions reveal themselves to earnest-minded men. Love of pleasure and

making: erotic compositions, Latin rhymes, imitations of Catulius, Italian songs, Imitations of Petrarch, won for him an undeserved reputation as a poet and a well-merited fame as an intellectual and charming companion. The turning point of his life came in 1431, when Cardinal Capranica, being accidentally in Siena on his way to Basie, took him for his secretary.

The fifteenth century was the golden age of private secretaries; the most accomplished numanists worked in this capacity in the chanceries of Popes, Princes and Cardinals, where, as seekers for favor, they pursued fortune amid a labyrinth of intrigues. Henceforward, for twenty-two years, Eneas Sylvius led a restless and wandering life in Germany, a country which seemed barbarous in the eyes of most Italians, but, in Piccolomini, awoke, for the first time, the sympathy of a foreigner. He dedicated some of his writings to its history and geography. Beyond the Alps, Eneas Sylvius served several masters in quick success sion as secretary, always studying mankind with an eager desire for knowledge, and, with acute observation, jotting down witty notes of all that he beheld. Life was his school; he owe more to experience than did almost any other man of his time. Not that experience made of him a strong character, or urged him to under take great deeds. What it did for him was to develop him into a many-sided man and an accomplished humanist. It is interesting to recall that in the course of his extensive travels, he visited England and Scotland. He played considerable part in the Council of Basle, the reforming principles of which, opposed to the views of the Papacy, he upheld in his Dialogues. At Frankfort, whither he had been sent as an envoy of the Council, he was crowned Poet Laureate by the Emperor Frederick III., who gave him a post in the Imperial Chancery, where ng soon became the confidant of the celebrated Chancellor Caspar Schlick. Equally versed in the affairs of the Empire and of the Roman Curia, he strove incessantly to acquire benefice that should raise him out of poverty. He was not inspired by any ardent longing for virtue, nor was he stirred by the sublime longings of an exalted nature. In a word, there was nothing great in him. Endowed with fascinating gifts, this man of brilliant parts possessed no enthus iasms. It cannot be said that, before he ascended the Papal Chair, he pursued any aim beyond his own advantage. He followed many paths without committing any crime and without evincing any malice, but without strict conscientiousness, acquiring favor by flattery and pleasant manners, not conquering esteem by virtue of strength. His finely strung nature and exquisite asthetic taste preserved him from low vices. That a man such as Piccolomini should be

come Pope was a novelty characteristic of the new age, since his career had been essentially that of a travelling secretary. He did not issue from a convent, nor had he followed any decided ecclesiastical calling, or filled the position of a prince of the Church, until, in 1458, Calixtus III, had created him a Cardinal; even then he was so poor that he was forced to conone his pursuit of benefices. He had not belonged to any party, but had led a bustling. diplomatic career, for the most part outside of Italy. Al. the humanists and rhetoricians the "Bohemians" of the fifteenth century whose ideal of fortune culminated in an Episcopal see, now saw with delight that a lax poet and writer of their time might rise to the Papal throne, as well as holy ascetics in the devout Middle Ages. When the literary friends of his past life learned that Piccolomint called calculated to exalt the prestige of the Sacred himself Pius II., they probably inferred that he had chosen the name, not because it had been borne by a Roman Emperor, but because Virgil had bestowed it on Eneas. In Nicholas V the Papal throne had been occupied by humanistic learning: In Plus II., the accomplished man the world, it was tenanted by the astheticrhetorical genius of a modern and versatile age. Intellect, inspired by the genius of antiquity, appeared in Piccolomini as the perfection of a cultivated and gifted personality Popes of the past, such as Gregory VII., Alexander III. and Innocent III., beheld through he twilight of the Middle Ages, had begun to look like gigantic mythical figures. By their side the form of a man such as Pius II, seemed insignificant and profane; but it was at least a portrait belonging to a world which in every section had become more humane and liberal than that which ad been ruled over by those solitary denigods. Saints, it is true, might igh for the sublime ideal of the Middle Age which, with the awful grandeur of its Christian virtues, was sinking beyond hope of rescue in the current of a secular and classic epoch.

When Aneas Sylvius ascended the Sacred

Chair at the age of 53 his health was shattered.

Tortured by gout, the familiar allment the Popes, small and feebly built, already bald and of pale and aged aspect, his eyes alone revealed the soul within. In him the literary world expected a great Mæcenas. Filelfo and his associates promised themselves an Augustan Age, but soon turned away in disillusion from a Pope who would no longer have any intercourse with them. Like many men who, having risen to power, turn their backs on their past Pius II. put literature aside. The thought of his earlier life and of the principles which ne had upheld in opposition to the Papacy filled him at times with disquietude. He would have sacrificed vast wealth to wine away the remembrance of his doings at Basle, or to de stroy some of his writings, more especially his Dialogues, the love letters and other like productions. As late as 1463, about a year be fore his death, he repeated the "retraction" uttered when he accepted the pontificate, is which he likened himself to St. Paul and St Augustine-"reject Aneas," he said, "and retain Pius." This recantation, which he addressed to a body of surly theologians in Cologne, bears no trace of hypocrisy, neither does it express the contrition of a profoundly repentant devotee. It is ac onfession, written in the elegant and rhetorical style of a man well ac quainted with the world, who solaces himself with the axiom that to err is human. So far as other men were concerned, the recollection of his frivolons past, which had not been suffied by any crime, soon vanished amid the genial humanism of his day, and, if ever the errors of youth may be pardoned to age, Plus II. might claim forgiveness. His life as Pope was unspotted. He was temperate, mild. penevolent and indulgent and was universally beloved. He was not, to be sure, qualified for the part of universal monarch or even that for of ruler of the States of the Church. His highly cultivated but unvirile intellect required a different horizon. Unless his Papacy, ever, were to remain unrecorded as having performed no task of historical importance, it needed to should be marked by a great outburst of European energy. The deliverance of Constantinople was his aim, undoubtedly a lofty one, and in harmony with the spirit of the age: as might have been expected, the Greek Cardinal, Bessarion, exerted himself with no less zeal in its behalf. No one will seek in Piccolomini for the religious enthusiasm that had formerly inspired Urban II. or that had stirred simple monks in the era of the first crusade. Desire for fame, a poetic imagination; also, no doubt, religious feeling, and, especially, a deep consciousness of Papal duty, were the motives of his action. Eneas Sylvius was in earnest in his promotion of the war against the Turks; he remained faithful to his enthusiasm: even before he became Cardinal he had spoken at many imperial diets and had written many a paper, in favor of the

After the death of Innocent VIII. the Cardinals met in conclave on Aug. 6, 1492. Their choice fell upon Cardinal Rodrigo Borgia. who took the name of Alexander VI. It is said that before the Conclave the success with money to the house of Cardinal Ascanio Sforza. Borgia also promised to give Sforza his own polace with all its contents. the office of Vice-Chancellor and other benefices. That Ascanio received the Palazzo Borgia is indisputable, and he was appointed Vice-Chancellor by brief of Alexander VI. on Aug. 26, 1402. Sforza was by no means the only mem-Thomas Parentucelli, who became Pope in vanity urged him onward in the path of verse- celli and Soriano were given to Cardinal Orsini;

the Commenda of Subjaco, with all its fortreases, was ceded in perpetuity to the Polonna. On Cardinal Michiel was conferred the Bishopric of Portus, on Cardinal Sciafetani the town of Nepi and on Cardinal Savelli Civita Castellana, while large sums of money were promised in various directions. Even Patriarch of Venice, aged 95, stretched forth his trembling hand for 5,000 ducats. It is said that only five members of the Conclave sed sufficient self-respect to repel Borgia's offers. Under the circumstances, it is scarcely possible to describe the decision of the tificate. conclave as an act of the Holy Chost. It is, at the same time, pointed out by Gregorovius that, in choosing Rodrigo Borgia, the Cardinals were not electing Alexander VI. as we now se him in history. The private excesses, indeed, of Cardinal Borgia were well known. Pius II. had already consured them; but was he the only prelate guilty of such offences? The morality of that age condoned nothing more readily than sensual misdeeds. Borgia had children by a mistress; but had not innocent VIII. recently acknowledged his own illegitimate offspring and made princes of them The truth is that, as a Cardinal, Rodrigo Borgia had not been looked upon as particularly wicked A contemporary who describes his characte "He is a man of aspiring mind, of mod of crafty nature, but above all of admirable intellect where action is concerned." His long services in the Church, his thorough knowledge of business, his personal majesty and the in tellectual as well as physical strength, which he retained at the age of 61, convinced the electors that he was eminently worthy of the Papacy." At all events, he was unanimously chosen, and it is admitted that five of the Cardinals were not bribed .

The career of Alexander VI. before he became Pope may be outlined in a paragraph. Rodrigo Lanzol Borgia was born at Xativa near Valencia, in Spain, on Jan. 1, 1431; he was the son of a nobleman of moderate means, Don Jofre, and of Donna Isabel de Borgia, sister of Calixtus III. After he had studied canon law at Bologna, his uncle made him a Cardinaldeacon, and soon after Vice-Chancellor of the Church. Rodrigo also received from the Pope, his uncle, the bishopric of Valencia; under Sixtus IV. he became Bishop of Portus and Legate for Spain. His wealth, partly inherited from Calixtus III., and partly from his brother, Don Pedro Luis, the favorite of that Pope, was in creased by the revenues of three bishoprics and several convents to Spain and Italy, and by the office of Vice-Chancellor, which alone brought him 8,000 gold florins a year. Reputed the richest Cardinal after Estouteville he dwelt in the megnificent palace now knows as the Sforza-Cesarini, which he had erected among the bank buildings. The Roman chroniclers occasionally mention the magnificence which he displayed there; but no one speaks o extravagant banquets such as were given by Paul II. as Cardinal, or by Estouteville, Rirario, or Ascanio. It seems that Rodrigo, grasping by nature, kept a tight hold upon his wealth, step which consideration for his children and for his own future may have counselled. He was of a passionately sensuous temperament, which is alleged to have given him a magnetic attraction for women; but he himself was so ensnared, first by the charms, and then by the astuteness, of a woman, that he acknowledged her fatters as no less binding than those of marriage. This woman was Vanozza de Cataneis, a member, perhaps, of the lesser

It would be a mistake to imagine Borgia's friend a Messalina. The circumstances of her life are not well known, and it is only from the ages of her children that we arrive at the conclusion that her relations toward Cardinal Rodrigo may have begun shortly before 1470 she was herself born in July, 1442. According to the doubtful assertion of Infessura, who was an enemy, the Cardinal first caused his mistress to marry a certain Domenico of Arignano. Roman documents show her to have been married twice again. About 1480, she was the wife of Giorgio de Croce, a Milanese, who was appointed by Cardinal Rodrigo apostolic secretary. He died in 1485, and the next year his widow married a Martuan, Carlo Canale who, after 1490, is spoken of as secretary to the Penitenziaria, and, in 1498, as soldan or bailiff of the Torre di Nona. Vanozza was 50 years old and was still the wife of Canale when her former lover became Pope, and she acliving children, Juan, Cæsar, Jofre and Lucrezia She even assumed the surname of Borgia, though not, it would appear, until after the death of Alexander VI. Her lover had outlived his passion, but not his attachment for her, and the shrewd woman henceforward, satisfied with the good fortune of her children, remained so entirely aloof from public affairs that her name is never linked in history with that of the Borgias, even by the bitterest enemies of the House. Jovius speaks of her personally as an upright woman Such, at all events, she became when, like so many of her kind-her own celebrated daughter. for instance-she strove to explate the sins of

The election of Borgia is pronounced by Guicelardini one of the greatest misfortunes that ever befell Italy. So in the end it proved but the author of the book before us dispute the Italian historian's assertion that the election awoke from the outset universal apprehension and even drew tears from the King of Naples The fact is that many Romans received the news of Borgia's election with joy. Bo distinguished and jovial a man augured a splendid pontificate; his handsome person won him the favor of the people. The Magistrates went in procession on horseback by torchlight to greet him on the evening of his elevation. "I think," said a chronicler, "that Cleopatra was not received with greater magnificence by Marc Antony," and this sincere admirer of Borgia, going on to compare the torch-bearers to th ancient bacchantes, gives naive expression to the pagan spirit of his time. The coronation festival on Aug. 26 was celebrated with a spler dor hitherto unknown. Artistic taste and servility vied with one another in glorifying the Spaniard Borgia as a divinity. In utter ignorance concerning the future, the Cardinals and nobles who were soon to be reduced by him to the extremity of ruin, were at lavish expense to do him homage. Statues and pictures, triumphal arches and altars stood in the streets Epigrams which would now read like satirica pasquinades, but which were then as sincere as audacious flattery could be, proclaimed the glory of a new "Alexander the Great." Perhaps some Christian may have looked in grief upor the pagan pomp, on the mythological figures of gods and on the noisy procession in the midst of which the successor of the Apostles wa borne like an idol on a gilded car, while the air was filled with the shouts of the populace, the braying of trumpets and the thunder o cannon. There was, however, at the time in Rome only one small congregation of men who had kept pure their despised religion; the repre sentatives of the synagogue awaited the Papa procession on a tribune beside S. Angelo, where amid the laughter of the Christians they offered the roll of the Pentateuch in reverence to Alexander VI.

Evidently the new Pope had not yet revealed his true nature. A high opinion of his character was entertained in foreign countries Our author points out that Hartmann Schedel soon after Borgia's elevation, wrote in his chronicle that the world had much to expect from the virtues of such a Pope. When the ambassadors of the Italian powers, who brought him professions of obedience in the early months of his reign, extolled his character istics, they employed, no doubt, conventional phrases of flattery; nevertheless, a genuine conviction of the rare gifts of the Pope betrays itself. It must also be owned that Rodrigo Borgia in the beginning of his pontificate showed himself a shrewd and vigorous regent. Rigorous justice, the punctual payment of officials and the enforcement of moderate prices in the markets were the means adopted by Alexander VI. to recommend his rule. The terrible abuses in the administration of law were abolished. The result was that Rome was quiet and contented. The new Pope, it is true, was not

lavish, like Nicholas V.; on the contrary, he was frugal. The accounts of his household expenditure show that great moderation was the rule of his court. Our author has examined them, and finds that the cost of maintaining the Papai household under Alexander VI. was from 20 to 30 ducats a day; the ducat was worth less than 80 cents. Amid these favorable signs, one fact alone awakened apprehension on the part of close observers, to wit: the recklessness exhibited by Rodrigo Borgia in his nepotism from the first hour of his pon-It was, in truth, his passionate of his children that proved fatal to himself and Italy. It was this that drew him to crime, from which, otherwise, in all likelihood, he would have kept free. Gregorovius, for his part, can discove in the history of the thirteen years of Alexander's pontificate no other guiding principle than that of aggrandizing his children at any cost. The extirpation of numerous tyrants and the foundation of Casar Borgia's ephemeral principality, established on a thousand crimes, were the political aims of this Pope To these objects of nepotism he sacrificed his own conscience, the happiness of nations the independence of Italy and the good of the Church. A war of more than half a century, and more terrible than all earlier wars of medieval times, made the Italian peninsula a waste, destroyed the prosperity of its cities, quenched the sentiment of nationality and freedom and. beneath the degradation of foreign rule, plunged a great nation into a sleep of centurie which resembled the period of exhaustion that followed the Gothic invasions. If Alexander VI. was not the sole author of this deep abasement, to which many other causes con-tributed, he, at all events, surrendered Italy to the French and Spaniards with the sole object of aggrandizing his bastards. He was one of the fundamental factors of the ruin of

his country, and he occupies the same position in the history of the Church. As regards the city of Rome itself the last spark of civic consciousness expired under the rule of the Borgias, beneath which the Roman people became utterly demoralized. Later historians have expressed surprise that, in view of so many murders and other crimes, Rome never rose against Alexander VI. Gregorovius deems it more absurd to suppose that the city remained tranquil because it was satisfled with the rule of the Pope. He finds the causes of the peaceful attitude maintained by the Romans during this pontificate in the terrorism inspired by the Borgia government, with its spies, executioneers and Spanish soldiers, in the corruption of the people themselves and in their already abject state. Jovius, a historian of the time, and himself a Bishop, says: "Whether it be from recollection of thei former splendor and their ancient freedom or from their wild and restless spirit, the Ro mans cannot tranquilly endure the rule of priests, which often appears immoderate and avaricious." Nevertheless, although their city sank into a condition that recalls the times of the most infamous Emperors of antiquity, the Romans now only launched impotent satires against Alexander. We seem to be listening to Tacitus when a contemporary of the Borgia writes: "The effrontery of the gladiators was never greater in the city, the liberty of the people never less. It swarmed with informers. The slightest expression of hatred was punished with death. Moreover, Rome was entirely filled with robbers, and no street was safe at night. Rome, in every age the asylum of nations, had become a shambles. and all this was committed by Alexander VI. for love of his children." Another eyewitness of the rule of Alexander VI., the afterward renowned Cardinal Egidlus of Viterbo, drew the following picture of the city: "Everything was hidden in darkness and stormy night; touching the things that were done in the family and the Thyestean tragedies, I will keep silence; never were there more terrible revolts in the cities

> freedom, now the Italians sank from independence into darkest servitude to the foreigner. What has this latest historian of the Borgias to say about Lucrezia, the beautiful daughter of the Pope? The view of her taken by Gregorovius will be found set forth on page 485. just after the description of her third marriage to the heir of the Duke of Ferrara. Our author recalls that, although the festival celebrated on the occasion was of fabulous magnificence, yet the attitude of those who took part in the ceremony was perfunctory and cold. Isabella of Este, sister of the bridegroom, writing to her husband Gonzaga at Mantua, congratulates him on not being present. It is certain that the daughter of the Borgias brought with her the memories of a painful past, and reports had preceded her which, even if unounded, would have thrown any proud woman into agonies of distress. She may have been glad to exchange Rome for less corrupt Ferrara. and in her new home she outlived the fall of her family. Few women in history have exercised so great a fascination on contemporary and later generations as Lucrezia, who only required wider opportunities to become a Cleopatra. The figure of the Pope's daughter, between her terrible father and more terrible brother, in part their tragic victim and an object of pity, in part a seductive siren, and, lastly, a penitent Magdalen, exercises a charm on the imagination by the mystery which sur rounds her, and amid the obscurity of which guilt and innocence seem to struggle for supremacy. When Duchess of Ferrara, Lucrezia Borgia renounced the passions of her early life. As her mother, Vanozza, had done before her she gave herself up to devotion and to works of Christian piety. She thus spent tranquil years with Alfonso, to whom she bore several children, until her death on June 24, 1519. Gregorovius adds: "But, during this period, no one ever looked into her soul, where it is hard to believe that the terrible spectres that must have haunted her memory were ever laid to

more bloody deaths. Never were robberies

committed with such impunity in the streets

never was Rome so full of criminals; never

was the multitude of informers and robbers so

audacious. People could neither leave the

gates of the city nor dwell within it. To own

money or valuable property was equivalent

to being guilty of high treason. There was

no protection, either in house, sleeping room

or tower. Justice was effaced. Money, power

and lust governed everything. Hitherto, since

tyranny, she had remained exempt from the

rule of the stranger, for, although King Al-

fonso was an Aragonese, in peither culture,

liberality nor magnanimity was he inferior to

any Italian. Now, however, slavery followed

from foreign

Italy had emancipated herself

Rughy and Oxford Half a Century Ago. It is the reminiscences of Oxford in the early fifties that constitute the real excuse for the publication of the Memorials of Charles Henry eorson (Longmans). We doubt if more than score of Americans have ever heard Mr. Pearon's name, yet he was a man who, in his day, endeavored to imitate, and did, to a certain extent, reproduce, Lord Sherbrooke's successful career in England and Australia. Like Mr. Lowe he took a first class in Literae Humaniores at Oxford, and, like him, he became a minister n an Australian colony. So far, the paralle is exact, but Lowe returned to England to become Chancellor of the Exchequer and a peer, while Pearson had to content himself with the relatively humble post of Secretary to the Agent-General of Victoria in London. That part of the book before us which deals with the subject in the capacity of statesman and orator we shall pass over for the reason that scarcely anybody, even in Australia, regards him from that point of view. If the memoir was worth publishing at all, it is, as we have said, on account of the autobiographical substratum wherein Mr. Pearson sets forth his recollect tions of Rugby and of Oxford. It is to these chapters of the volume that we shall confine

Charles Henry Pearson was born on Sept. 1830, at the Church Missionary College, Islington, of which his father, the Rev. John Norman Pearson, was at the time principal. We learn from the autobiography that the boy was kept from school for the first twelve years

for me, morally and intellectually. Though my father was too well read to be a Calvinist he and my mother were both influenced by the tone of the Evangelical school. The most innocent amusements, from dancing to the theatre, were proscribed, and our dissipation was to attend a Bible society or a missionary When Charles Pearson went meeting." Rugby, Dr. Arnold had recently died. The school had not suffered in numbers, for it was known that Tait was an admirable successor, and Arnold's influence was still param mong masters and boys. Pearson says that "To one who looks back dispassionately it sometimes seems as if the doctor had been extravagantly overpraised. The world at large believes, or used to believe, that he swept away the exclusiveness of a classical training and to a great extent substituted modern studies such as history, French and German. All this must be taken with a good deal of allowance. In the first place, Arnold was in no sense the originator of the doctrine that a boy's studies might be leavened with a little useful knowledge." In the second place. French and German were very poorly taught at Rugby. Three years after Pearson had jeft school he found himself obliged to spend a few weeks in a small German town, and he resolved to master the language. He found that he had to begin again from the very alphabet, although, nominally, he had been translating Schiller at school. One respect in which Arnold is thought to

have inaugurated a new era was the moral in-

fluence he exercised over his scholars.

us hear Pearson's testimony on this point: "
am not prepared to dany his influence in this direction, but I doubt if it was exclusively good. In the first place he had a danger sity to impel his pupils into Holy Orders. two important cases this had distinctly bad requits. One old scholar, who obeyed the impulse and found himself strangled in a white tie, took to free-thought and became head of that early Positivist Church of which it was said that it consisted of 'three persons and no God.' Another, who had promised better things, wanting the strength to break free from orthodoxy, became a formaitst, and ended his days as a torpid Church dignitary. I cannot doubt that Clough. almost the ablest of Arnoid's pupils, though he escaped ordination, owed much of his morbid scrupulosity to the Rugby influence. These, however, are extreme instances. On the other hand, it is, I think, undoubted that Arnold's pupils lived in an atmosphere of priggishness. They were taught to be always feeling their moral muscles, always careful about their schoolfellows morality, and always mindful of the high mission which they took with them into the world as Rugby boys. The precepts were more weighty than boys could assimilate without Incessant pretentiousness, and before long Rugby was known at Oxford as the 'disagreable school.' Its reputation in the Army was, I believe, even worse. Now it may well be that Oxford undergraduates and regimental messes are not infatilible judges of a desirable tone. Parents, no doubt, saw another side to the controversy, namely, that the Rugby men were honorably careful not to run into debt, to gamble or to indulge in the different forms of social immorality that were not severely reprehended in young men at college forty years ago. The imple fact is, however, that Rugby men were no better than the best set from any good pubile school, Eton, Harrow or Winchester. The difference was that the Rugbelans were selfonsolously moral, and this difference was to their di advantage as men of the world. Again, in the rare instances where a Rugby man renounced the idea of his apostolate, and lapsed upon fast courses, he incurred something of the odlum that attaches to the backsilding 'professor' of a religious community. The fault verstrained." of the ecclesiastical State, more sacks and Pearson also thinks that Dr. Arnold.

> through no fault of his own. It ommon delusion that a first-rate headmaster can make of a clever boy a genius and transform a dullard into an average member of society. The fact is that no teaching car take the place of natural endowments, and that a boy's schoolmates have much more influence over his character than any single teacher or than the whole collective staff. It so happened that the Rugby of Arnold's time was one Clough and Arthur Stanley are the three of his pupils who really achieved eminence: Tom Hughes, and Hodson of Hodson's Horse, are known creditably by their works; and Henry smith made himself the greatest of living English mathematicians by striking into line for which Rugby was no preparation. This is far from being a large list for fourteen years of scholastic activity, and Eton has repeatedly furnished more brilliant lists for a shorter period: while Rugby itself, under one of its very worst headmasters, turned out a whole nuster-roll of distinguished men, such as Goschen, Lord Justice Bowen and Prof. Sidswick. While making this criticism, however Pearson deems it only fair to note that a school like Rugby, chiefly recruited from the sons of not over-rich professional men, is heavily weighted in England in the competition with schools like Eton and Harrow. thinks that rank and wealth for something like two-thirds in struggle for success in England. Half Lord Beaconsfield's Ministry were Eton men. They had gone to Eton because it is the aristocratic school; they got into Parliament be cause their wealth enabled them to dispense with professional work, and because their birth recommended them to constituencies Pearson is evidently of the opinion that men like Ward Hunt would never have arisen above the ranks if they had had to make their own

considered as a teacher, was unfortunate

The one Rugby man who has really distinguished himself in Parliament is Mr. Goschen Even in his case, his early promotion was resented for a time with personal virulence by men of his own party, who would cheerfully have deferred to him if he had belonged to a county family. Pearson also believes that f Arthur Stanley had not been connected with the peerage, he would have been hunted out of the Church of England instead of being allowed to end his days as a dean and a favorite at court. One of Pearson's contemporaries at Rugby was Lawrence, now best remembered by his first book "Guy Livingstone," which, perhaps, has been saved from oblivion by Bret Harte's parody of it, "Guy Heavystone." For some years this and other novels by Lawrence were the delight of milliners' apprentices and of fast undergraduates. It was the day when Kingsley was preaching the gospel of "muscular Christianity." Lawrence cleverly parodled this by an evangel of muscular paganism, his heroes being generally athletic savages who combined the morals of the regency with a veneer which was purely original. "Cockeyed Lawrence," as he was irreverently called at Rugby, was, it seems, much what his books would lead a reader to suppose. He was distinctly clever and achieved a prize poem of more than average excellence; he was a good eaper and above the mark in football and cricket, and he gave himself precocious airs of men-of-the-worldliness. Pearson adds: "I have often smiled over a story of Guy Livingstone's early life which represents him as flirting with the head master's wife at a dinner party, to the manifest discomposure head master. I remember hearing that ineident discussed at the time, but it impressed onlookers differently, and the verdict was that Lawrence had made an awful fool of him-

Two years after taking a first class in Greats, that is to say in 1854, Pearson became a Fellow of Oriel College. Oriel, though it ranked fairly high in popular estimation at the time, was more famous for its past generation of Fellows, the heads of the fligh Church and Broad Church movements, than for the excollence of its teaching. Dr. Hawkins, then Provost, is described as "a man of the highest character, of more than average ability and of deficient judgment. His chief characterisof his life. "The training," he says, "was bad tion were essential manliness and generosity.

Orthodox to the core by temperament, and I imagine, rather Conservative than Liberal, if he had not fallen under Liberal influences as a young man, he held from the bottom of his soul that distinction of any kind was to be allowed free play, and not only tolerated but recognized. He was the friend of Blanco White to the last, after Whately and every other clergyman had thrown him over. He warmly admired Hurrell Froude, whom he placed in private conversation above any of the fligh Church leaders; and having been divided from Newman by party exigencies, he contrived to be reconciled, and went to visit him at Oscott. He stood manfully by Hampden in public when the whole clerical world assailed him, while he is reported to have told the Premier in private that his selection of Hampden for a bishopric had been a most improper one. When Clough resigned his fellowship, on the ground that he had gone over to Unitarianism, Dr. Hawkins entreated him not to sacrifice his prospects till he had thought his convictions over and was satisfied of their soundness. In politics, the Provost voted for Mr. Gladstone to the last, holding that the constituency had no right to dictate opinions to a man of preeminent merit. It will be noticed that the Provost was larger-souled than the Oxford don of popular imagination is conceived. As was only natural in so strong a man, he had the courage, of his opinions, and was a resolute asserter of his authority. 'Your Provost,' said an Oxford tutor to me once, 'would make himself obeyed if he were on his deathbed." complete the picture we are assured that Hawkins was a man of genuine kindness and un obtrusive plety.

Pearson expresses the hope that it may be impossible for the coming generation to understand the badness of the Oxford teaching in his day. Although the High Church movement was rapidly dying out, enough of it remained to leaven a good deal of the instruction given. The purely secular part of the curriculum was almost entirely on the classical side. It is true that, what the outside world knows as a classical first is really a first in the "Humaner Literature," and includes a smattering of andent history and of science so called. The science, however, had nothing to do with the discoveries of Newton, and Davy, and Clerk Maxwell, but meant logic and metaphysics on the lines of the seventeenth century. "I have," says Pearson, "some right to criticise, for I was passionately fond of these studies and agree with Dr. Arnold that they constituted the backbone of Oxford men. Still, I think it was radically wrong that our text book in logic for the schools was a miserable compilation by Aldrich, which was an epitome of almost every possible blunder. It was as if geography were taught on the system of Ptolemy, the teachers explaining now and then what results had been superseded by modern science. So, again, with philosophy. We learned the Ethics of Aristotle almost by heart, and it was worth doing, but scarcely a tutor could do anything more than comment on the text, or give us the notes of one or two English-or it might be German commentators. The Scotch school, the school of Kant, were practically unknown quantities, except, it may be, at Balliol, or to those who-like Lord Carnarvon-were able to retain Dean (then Mr.) Mansel as a private tutor. Nevertheless, the worst result of the Oxford teaching was not so much even its flagrant inadequacy as that it had a superficial completeness, from the skill with which clever men, constantly grinding at it, had reduced it into form. To have left Oxford hungering for real knowledge would have been beneficial: to leave it—as most of us did—thoroughly selfcomplacent, and believing that the university had taught us very nearly the last word in philosophy, was unmixedly mischievous. The history teaching, though less pretentious, was on rather sounder lines, because Grote and Thirlwall, and even Niebuhr, transmitted brough Arnold, supplemented our studies in Thucydides and Livy with greater life and completeness than our philosophical teachers put into Plato and Aristotle."

Every generation at a college has its specific haracter, and the one that Pearson knew at Oriel was distinctly clever and Bohemian. Lacking guidance and stimulus from the college staff, it threw itself upon English literature, rson and Carlyle, Mill and Grote, Tennyson and Keats. It was a pleasant theory of the college that all its inmates knew one another and, as a matter of fact, the breakfasts and though, of course, not predominantly intellectual, were so to a considerable extent. Pearson thinks that some of the ablest of the number might have done almost anything if they had chosen to work. "One, a man of great rhetorical powers, and with a rare gift for knowing a few books well, deliberately decided not to read for the schools because he could not be sure of a first class, and believed that, to get a second, would injure him at the bar. His university distinction was confined to speeches at the Union, of which he was President, and he unfortunately did not live to realize the hopes his friends had formed for him by success in the law courts Another of my contemporaries, the most original and suggestive of all our number, miscarried partly through indolence and partly through aiming at transcendental perfection. The in dolence showed itself in irregular hours; and the fact that his rooms were the pleasantes social meeting place for the literary set undoubtedly contributed to delay their owner's preparation for the schools. When, however, he took it up in earnest, he was a victim of his own ideal. He spent a whole term over a play of Æschylus, knowing it at the end-Prof. Conington declared-more thoroughly than Conington himself. But as he necessarily had only mastered about a fiftieth of his work for Greats, the effort after heroic perfection ended at last in a simple pass. Finally, a possible student of rare promise buried himself in commerce. I do not believe either of these comparative failures would have happened at Balliol, where the tutors directed the undergraduates with supreme efficiency, and obtained almost complete obedience from all but

the very fast." What were the diversions of undergraduates at Oriel fifty years ago? In Pearson's day the dons as a rule were wise enough to see that young men must have some amusement and were only solicitous that they should work of their steam harmlessly. Billiards were proscribed for the following reason: "The game is so fascinating as to absorb an extravagant amount of time, and its accompaniments smoking, drinking and betting, are scarectly of educational value." Hunting was commonly objected to as expensive and esinterfering with lectures. This left cricket and boating as the recognized forms of amuse ment, and of these boating was regarded by tutors as distinctly the best. To be in training for an Eight implies the keeping of regular hours and perfect sobriety and wholesom ness of life. Why, therefore, the Provost of Oriel should have taken it into his head that boat racing ought to be discouraged is not easily explicable. The reason he gave was that the overexertion necessary in a close contest led occasionally to heart disease. At any rate, what Dr. Hawkins did was to ask two or three of the Eight to dinner on one of the first race nights. If they accepted, their places in the boat had to be filled by novices, and the boat was sure to be bumped. If they declined, the Provost was as likely as not to send for them and to inform them that an invitation from him was a command. These tactics were successful in keeping the Oriel boat low and discouraging the exercise, but they made the Provost needlessly unpopular, and forced the men to some extent upon other forms of idleness Many years later Pearson discovered that the Provost believed himself to have been equally successful in putting down hunting by a regulation against it. The simple fact was that hunting was too expensive to be the pastime of more than a few undergraduates at Oriel, or for that matter of any college at Oxford, but whoever could afford it and cared for it could go pretty nearly as often as he liked by reporting himself on the sick list to escape lectures, and then slipping out of college with his "pink" artis-

tically covered by the academical gown which was left at a pastry oook's.